Case 2:05-cr-00152-RSL Document 229 Filed 08/25/06 Page 1 of 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 8 9 10 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 13 14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 15 Plaintiff, Case No. CR05-152RSL 16 v. ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S 17 LAM T. PHAM, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION 18 Defendant. 19 This matter comes before the Court on "Defendant Pham's Motion to Reconsideration" 20 (Dkt. # 228). "Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such 21 motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new 22 facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable 23 diligence." Local Rule CrR 12(c)(11)(A). Although defendant purports to allege new facts in 24 his motion for reconsideration, he fails to show why these facts could not have been brought to 25 26 ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR 27 **RECONSIDERATION-1** 28

the Court's attention in the previous motion. Moreover, the facts alleged by defendant in the instant motion contradict his sworn testimony at his plea hearing. <u>See</u> Dkt. # 218. For these reasons, defendant's motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

DATED this 25th day of August, 2006.

MMS Cassik
Robert S. Lasnik
United States District Judge

ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION- 2